



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,608	10/17/2003	Lynn Ann Casey	10761.1477-00	8949
81331	7590	09/16/2011		
Accenture/Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP 901 New York Avenue Washington, DC 20001-4413			EXAMINER MCCORMICK, GABRIELLE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3629	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/16/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

betty.finley@finnegan.com
dianna.williams@finnegan.com
catherine.vanhouten@finnegan.com

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
2

3
4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
5 AND INTERFERENCES
6

7
8 *Ex parte* LYNN ANN CASEY and MAURINE T. SHIELDS
9

10
11 Appeal 2010-004624
12 Application 10/686,608
13 Technology Center 3600
14

15
16
17 Before MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, ANTON W. FETTING, and
18 BIBHU R. MOHANTY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.
19 FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

20 DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE¹

Lynn Ann Casey and Maurine T. Shields (Appellants) seek review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) of a final rejection of claims 13, 20, and 59-75, the only claims pending in the application on appeal. We have jurisdiction over the appeal pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

The Appellants invented a border management solution (Specification 1:¶ 0002).

An understanding of the invention can be derived from a reading of exemplary claim 13, which is reproduced below [bracketed matter and some paragraphing added].

13. A computer-based system for implementing a border management application architecture comprising:

[1] at least one processor;

[2] at least one computerized database storing border management data; and

[3] at least one computer-readable medium encoding instructions

for implementing a border management application architecture,

wherein said instructions include:

[4] providing a set of core applications

for standard border management functions

in a shared applications architecture,

¹ Our decision will make reference to the Appellants' Appeal Brief ("App. Br.," filed October 21, 2009) and Reply Brief ("Reply Br.," filed January 27, 2010), and the Examiner's Answer ("Ans.," mailed November 27, 2009).

wherein the set of core applications includes
a process imports application,
a process exports application,
one or more investigation applications,
an entry processing application,
an exit processing application, and
a form submission and processing
application;
[5] providing a customer channel interface
for interconnecting a set of customer channels
that provide individual access points
for a plurality of users
of the border management application
architecture and
the set of core applications;
[6] providing one or more management access interfaces
for interconnecting one or more management
access channels
with the set of core applications
to thereby provide access points and tools
for the sharing and access of border
management data
among the set of core applications; and
[7] providing an enforcement database
storing case data and individual data;
[8] wherein the set of core applications further comprise
a set of case management applications,
wherein the set of case management applications
further comprise
a set of intelligence applications

used to transform the border management
data into intelligence
using
the shared border management data
and
the case data and the individual data
stored in the enforcement database.

The Examiner relies upon the following prior art:

Wong US 6,115,690 Sept. 5, 2000

Bian US 2003/0115133 A1 June 19, 2003

Coalition for Secure & Trade-Efficient Borders, Rethinking our Borders:
A Plan for Action (Dec. 3, 2001),
http://www.canambta.org/Documents/Plan_For_Action.pdf .

Guy Gugliotta, *American Responds / Terrorist watch list no match for
pair / Hijacking suspects eluded all controls*, Houston Chronicle , Sept.
24, 2001,
[http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=82197148&sid=2&Fmt=3&client!
d=19649&RQT=309&VName=PQD&cfc=1.](http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=82197148&sid=2&Fmt=3&client!d=19649&RQT=309&VName=PQD&cfc=1.))

Claims 59, 64-69, and 71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first
paragraph, as lacking a supporting written description within the original
disclosure.²

Claims 13, 20, 60-62, 70, and 72-74 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §
103(a) as unpatentable over Wong and Coalition.

² The Examiner also included claims 13, 20, 60-63, 70, and 72-75 in this
rejection at Final Rejection 2. The rejection as to these claims was
withdrawn at Answer 2.

Claims 59, 64-67, and 71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wong, Coalition, and Bian.

Claims 68 and 69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wong, Coalition, Bian, and Gugliotta.

ISSUES

The issue of written description turns on whether the Appellants described sufficient species to show they were in possession of the genus.

The issue of obviousness turns on whether the modules recited in the claims are to be given patentable weight.

FACTS PERTINENT TO THE ISSUES

The following enumerated Findings of Fact (FF) are believed to be supported by a preponderance of the evidence.

Facts Related to the Prior Art

Wong

01. Wong is directed to business to business web commerce. Wong 1:11-12.

Coalition

02. Coalition is directed to an integrated plan for border management. Coalition 1:First ¶.

Bian

03. Bian is directed to a way to ascertain business risk. Bian ¶ 0001.

ANALYSIS

Claims 59, 64-69, and 71 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as lacking a supporting written description within the original disclosure.

We are unpersuaded by the Appellants' arguments that the original disclosure provides adequate support for the generic tools recited in the claims. For example, claim 59 recites an information synthesis application and a risk scoring and analytics application that applies neural networks, decision tree analysis, data recognition techniques, and rules-based algorithms to synthesize information, identify patterns, analyze historical information, and develop risk scores. The Appellants have not disclosed any specific implementations of these tools and techniques.

Although many original claims will satisfy the written description requirement, certain claims may not. For example, a generic claim may define the boundaries of a vast genus of chemical compounds, and yet the question may still remain whether the specification, including original claim language, demonstrates that the applicant has invented species sufficient to support a claim to a genus. The problem is especially acute with genus claims that use functional language to define the boundaries of a claimed genus. In such a case, the functional claim may simply claim a desired result, and may do so without describing species that achieve that result. But the specification must demonstrate that the applicant has made a generic invention that achieves the claimed result and do so by showing that the applicant has invented species sufficient to support a claim to the functionally-defined genus.

Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co., 598 F.3d 1336, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2010). The Appellants describe language in the Specification at Appeal Brief 28-30 that either echoes the claim language or describes activities in which such tools and techniques might occur, but none that describe actual

species that would show possession of the genus of the tools and techniques recited.

We are unpersuaded by the Appellants' arguments regarding claims 65-69 because these claims include the limitations from their parent claim 64.

Claims 13, 20, 60-62, 70, and 72-74 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wong and Coalition.

Claims 59, 64-67, and 71 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wong, Coalition, and Bian.

Claims 68 and 69 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wong, Coalition, Bian, and Gugliotta.

We are persuaded by the Appellants' arguments that the art fails to describe the structure as claimed.

As the Appellants contend, the Examiner simply asserted, erroneously, that the names of the databases and applications and the descriptive nature of the data are non-functional.

The names of the databases, core applications and data identify their functionality. By identifying the names of core applications, it is thus known what functions are to be performed by the core applications. For example, the core applications are identified as including "case management applications 320 [including] intelligence applications 3210, such as information synthesis 3212, and risk scoring and analytics 3214." Specification pg. 18, para. 60, lines 4-11. It will be apparent from the name of a risk scoring and analytics application that the software is configured to perform a risk scoring and analytics function. Similarly, by identifying the types of data and databases, it is thus known what functions the data and databases are to perform in the recited border management application architecture.

Appeal Br. 35-36. The independent claims recite computer implemented structures that perform specific functions pertinent to border management. The Examiner found that the art's structure describing a financial data product that analyzed risk using a neural net met those limitations. We fail to see how a business risk system describes a border management system with the functions recited in the claims. We find it was improper for the Examiner to give no patentable weight to the recited functions since the functions narrowed the structure of the system.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The rejection of claims 59, 64-69, and 71 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as lacking a supporting written description within the original disclosure is proper.

The rejection of claims 13, 20, 60-62, 70, and 72-74 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wong and Coalition is improper.

The rejection of claims 59, 64-67, and 71 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wong, Coalition, and Bian is improper.

The rejection of claims 68 and 69 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wong, Coalition, Bian, and Gugliotta is improper.

DECISION

To summarize, our decision is as follows.

- The rejection of claims 59, 64-69, and 71 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as lacking a supporting written description within the original disclosure is sustained.

- 1 • The rejection of claims 13, 20, 60-62, 70, and 72-74 under 35 U.S.C.
2 § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wong and Coalition is not sustained.
- 3 • The rejection of claims 59, 64-67, and 71 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as
4 unpatentable over Wong, Coalition, and Bian is not sustained.
- 5 • The rejection of claims 68 and 69 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as
6 unpatentable over Wong, Coalition, Bian, and Gugliotta is not
7 sustained.

8 No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this
9 appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). *See* 37 C.F.R.
10 § 1.136(a)(1)(iv) (2007).

11
12 AFFIRMED-IN-PART
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20